UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,993	12/31/2003	Laurence Rose	134164	9989
77216 ALCATEL-LU	7590 06/11/200 CENT	EXAMINER		
	% ASSOCIATES, LF	LAI, MICHAEL C		
P. O. BOX 26503 AUSTIN, TX 78755-0503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/749,993	ROSE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MICHAEL C. LAI	2157	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the c	over sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN	I CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same da application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) a application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The periods:	n amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the eal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the fir The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX NEXAMINETERS EXAMINET NOTE: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHEMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the phave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statuset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three momay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO etition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee a corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee atory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 3' filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	(37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to th  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration a  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for a	nd/or search (see NOTE below);
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	g number of finally rejected claims.
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attac	hed Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if sub non-allowable claim(s).	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below of the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-10 and 12-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or or because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient re was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	asons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of A entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was no	rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the statu REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	s of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT see Continuation Sheet.	place the application in condition for allowance because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB/08)</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	Paper No(s)
Yv	es Dalencourt/
	ary Examiner, Art Unit 2157

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument, see page 8, with respect to "silent device" in claims 1 and 10, is not persuasive. In the instant application, see page 7 lines 22 through 24, it defines "Silent devices are edge devices that are capable of responding to traffic transmitted by other devices, but that do not initiate traffic on their own." User devices in Tonnby's invention, see Figures 2 and 12, are all edge devices. Besides, the user device does not initiate traffic to other devices except broadcasts a DHCP or an ARP request (see abstract), which is a normal behavior for a silent device like a printer when plugged in to a network. As such, the user device in the reference is indeed a silent device. Applicant's argument, see page 8, with respect to "receiving a command associating the device to the VLAN" in claims 1 and 10, is not persuasive. Tonnby discloses that the users can select services by configuring their apparatuses to a selected one of the VLANs (see page 2, lines 8-10). The claimed limitation does not specify where "a command" is coming from, or if any human being is directly involved. As such, "receiving a command associating the device to the VLAN" could be interpreted as just one way of configuring the device to the VLAN. Applicant's argument, see page 9, with respect to "transmitting to the plurality of ports in response to the command, a first message configured to generate a response by the device" in claims 1 and 10, is not persuasive. The phrase "configured to" is language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (see MPEP 2106). As a result, the limitation after "configured to" carries no weight for the claim limitation. Thus, in view of such, the application is not in condition for allowance.